

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

In the Matter of:

THE TARIFF APPLICATION OF SOUTH)	
CENTRAL BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY)	
TO REFLECT CHANGES IN RATES AND)	CASE NO 9272
TEXT FOR CONDUIT OCCUPANCY)	
ACCOMODATIONS FOR INTERLATA)	
CARRIERS AND CATV FIRMS)	

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that South Central Bell Telephone Company ("South Central") shall file an original and 10 copies of the information requested in this Order with the Commission within 20 days from the date of this Order, with a copy to all parties of record. Each copy of the data requested should be placed in a bound volume with each item tabbed. When a number of sheets is required for an item, each sheet should be appropriately indexed, for example, Item 1(a), sheet 2 of 6. Include with each response the name of the witness who will be responsible for responding to questions relating to the information provided. Careful attention should be given to copied material to insure that it is legible. Where information requested herein has been provided along with the original application in the format requested herein, reference may be made to the specific location of said information in responding to this information request. When applicable, the information requested herein should be provided for total company operations and jurisdictional operations separately. If neither

the requested information nor a motion for an extension of time is filed by the stated date, the case may be dismissed.

Tariff And Rate Design Issues

1. Please provide all workpapers and other supporting documents utilized in the development of the cost/investment information for conduit occupancy. Provide any narrative explanations where necessary and all underlying assumptions.
2. Provide a narrative explanation of all changes implemented by the Company in the calculation of the conduit occupancy cost/rate information. Compare and contrast methodologies utilized in the present case with those utilized in Administrative Case 251-18. Justify all changes as necessary, giving all underlying assumptions.
3. Reconcile the cost components of conduit occupancy presented by the Company in Administrative Case 251-18, with those presented in the current case. Explain any variances in components between the two cases.
4. What is the Company's rationale for the proposed rate per duct foot of conduit in view of the cost information provided? Show all calculations utilized in the rate development.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 12th day of April, 1985.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Richard D. Hemmigh
For the Commission

Attest:

Secretary